



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/988,853 11/19/2001		John Teloh	SMQ-082CN1/P6396CNT	9384
959 7	11/01/2004		EXAMINER	
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP. 28 STATE STREET			BETIT, JACOB F	
BOSTON, MA 02109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s) .
Advisory Action	09/988,853	TELOH ET AL.
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jacob F. Betit	2164
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 30 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context of the con	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· , , ,	· <del></del>
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		/
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		SAM RIMELL PRIMARY EXAMINER
		•

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants arguments Sicola et al. does not teach "the step of grouping two data structures held by a storage device locally accessing a first electronic device" and Sicola et al. does not teach "a step of instructing the first data replication facility to generate a replica of the selected data based on the tracked changes to the one or more locations of the first storage medium were both addressed in the final office action and were not deemed purswasive.